1 2 3	TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP PAUL W. VAPNEK (State Bar No. 36576) JUDITH M. SCHVIMMER (State Bar No. 230285) Two Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor San Francisco, California 94111		
4	Telephone: (415) 576-0200 Facsimile: (415) 576-0300		
5	pwvapnek@townsend.com jmschvimmer@townsend.com		
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defenda		
7	SUNSET MOUNTAINS, INC., d/b/a MOSAIC T MARKET	TILE THE STATE OF	
8	DOGGED DIEDEN ET LAW D.C.		
9	9 JOHN W. DOZIER (pro hac vice) DONALD E. MORRIS (pro hac vice)		
10	DARRIN HOLENDER (State Bar No. 237015)		
11	301 Concourse Blvd. West Shore III, Suite 300		
12	Glen Allen, Virginia 23059 Telephone: (804) 346-9770		
13	Facsimile: (804) 346-0800 jwd@cybertriallawyer.com		
14	don@cybertriallawyer.com darrin@cybertriallawyer.com		
15			
16	Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant MOSAIC TILE SUPPLIES, LLC		
17			
18	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT	
19	NORTHERN DISTR	ICT OF CALIFORNIA	
20			
21	SUNSET MOUNTAINS, INC., d/b/a MOSAIC	Civil Action No. C 07 4007 (PJH)	
22	TILE MARKET. a California corporation,	JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT	
23	Plaintiff,	STATEMENT AND [PROPOSED]	
24	v.	ORDER	
25	MOSAIC TILE SUPPLIES, LLC, a Texas limited liability company,	Conference Date: December 13, 2007	
26	Defendant.	Time: 2:30 p.m. Courtroom: 3	
27			
28			

Pursuant to this Court's Standing Order and, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the parties jointly submit this Case Management Statement and Proposed Order following a meet and confer on Wednesday, December 5, 2007 among Judith M. Schvimmer, for the Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant Sunset Mountains, Inc. d/b/a Mosaic Tile Market ("Mosaic"), and Donald E. Morris and Nicholas T. Moraites, for the Defendant and Counterclaimant Mosaic Tile Supplies, LLC ("MTS"). Each party certifies that its lead trial counsel who will try this case met and conferred for the preparation of this Statement.

The parties make the following representations and recommendations:

## A. JOINT STATEMENT OF FACTS AND EVENTS UNDERLYING THE ACTION

The parties entered into a business relationship in 2003. Plaintiff, an operator of an online tile showroom and store, contends that this relationship was purely that of a reseller, in which the Plaintiff resold the Defendant's products. Defendant, an online source for glass, stainless steel, and porcelain mosaic tiles, alleges that this relationship was that of an exclusive distributorship, whereby Plaintiff was to sell only Defendant's products on its website and not compete with the Defendant.

In late 2006, the Defendant contends that Plaintiff violated the terms of an alleged agreement between the parties. Plaintiff denies that there was any such agreement or that it violated any of the terms of such agreement. The parties agreed to end the business relationship under specific terms which are, in part, in dispute.

Defendant contends that the Plaintiff infringed on Defendant's trademarks during this period.

Plaintiff denies any such violation. There continues to be a dispute between the parties regarding the nature of the relationship and use of Defendant's intellectual property.

Plaintiff alleged in its First Amended Complaint for a Declaratory Judgment that Defendant misused its copyrights, committed acts of unfair competition, and tortiously interfered with prospective business relationships. Defendant has denied these claims and filed a Counterclaim

28

alleging trademark infringement, tortious interference of prospective business relations, misappropriation of trade secrets, unfair competition, and breach of contract.

## B. PRINCIPAL ISSUES

- 1. The principal factual issues that the parties dispute are:
  - a. the nature of the parties' business relationship
  - b. the terms of the parties' termination of their business relationship
  - b. the extent of the parties' respective intellectual property rights
- 2. The principal legal issues that the parties dispute are:
  - a. the extent of MTS's trademark rights and whether those rights have been infringed through Mosaic's marketing and sale of MTS products;
  - the extent of MTS's copyright rights and whether those rights have been infringed through Mosaic's marketing and sale of MTS products and whether those rights were misrepresented in connection with MTS's DMCA Take Down Notice;
  - c. the legal relationship between the parties, including whether Mosaic was a licensee of MTS and whether Mosaic was an exclusive distributor of MTS;
  - d. the legal obligations connected to the resale of another manufacturer's product;
  - e. the existence of any trade secret protection for the parties' respective business information;
  - f. whether either party intentionally misled the other or made knowingly false representations;
  - g. whether the parties competed unfairly;

 $\parallel$ 

1		h. whether either party intentionally interfered with the other's business
2		relationships with third parties;
3	3.	The following issues as to service of process, personal jurisdiction, subject matter
4		jurisdiction, or venue remain unresolved:
5		Neither party believes there are any such issues.
6 7	4.	The following parties have not yet been served:
8		None at this time
9	5.	Any additional parties that a party intends to join are listed below:
10	J.	
11	_	None at this time
12	6.	Any additional claims that a party intends to add are listed below:
13		None at this time.
14		C. ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION
15	The parties agree to mediation of the litigation and aim to hold a mediation session before	
16		
17	April 13, 200	o.
18		D. CONSENT TO JURISDICTION BY A MAGISTRATE JUDGE
19	Neith	er party consents to a trial presided over by a Magistrate Judge.
20		
21		<u>E. DISCLOSURES</u>
22	The p	arties certify that on or before the December 27, 2007 deadline, they will have made the
23	following dis	closures in a Rule 26(f) report:
24 25	1.	Persons to be disclosed pursuant to Rule 26
26   26	2.	Categories of documents disclosed under Rule 26 or produced through formal
27		discovery
28	3.	A preliminary analysis of the damages or of the offset

1	4. Neither party has any relevant insurance policies as defined by Fed. R. Civ. P.
2	26(a)(1)(D)
3	5. The parties will disclose the following additional information by the date listed:
4	None at this time
5	Tyone at this time
6	Disclosures as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e) will be supplemented at the following
7	intervals: At three-month intervals.
8	F. EARLY FILING OF MOTIONS
9	The following motions expected to have a significant effect either on the scope of discovery or
10	other aspects of the litigation shall be heard by the date specified below:
12	At this time the parties anticipate that there will be motions for summary judgment.
13	G. DISCOVERY
14	
15	1. The parties have conducted or have underway the following discovery:
16	None.
17	2. The parties have negotiated the following discovery plan:
18	Only the limitations set forth below.
19	3. Limitations on discovery tools:
20	a. depositions (excluding experts) by:
21	Plaintiff: <u>10</u> Defendant: <u>10</u>
22	b. interrogatories served by:
23	Plaintiff: 25 Defendant: 25
24	c. document production requests served by:
25	
26	Plaintiff: _70 Defendant:70
27	d. requests for admission served by:
28	Plaintiff: <u>40</u> Defendant: <u>40</u>

1	4.	The parties agree to the following limitations on the subject matter of discovery:
2		As set forth in the applicable Federal Rules.
3	5.	Discovery from experts. The parties tentatively plan to offer expert testimony as to the
4		following subject matter(s):
5		Resale rights, particularly with regard to use of manufacturer's and reseller's respective
6 7	i	trademarks on resale of product
8		Economic damages
9		Legal relationship between the parties
10		Whether MTS misrepresented its copyrights in connection with its service of a DMCA
11		Take Down Notice
12	6.	The Court orders the following additional limitations on the subject matter of
13		discovery:
14	7	
15	7.	Deadlines for disclosure of witnesses and completion of discovery:
16		a. completion of all discovery except from experts:
17		120 days before trial
18		b. disclosure of identities, resumes, final reports and all other matters required by Fed.
19		R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2):
20		90 days before trial
22		Rebuttal reports: two weeks subsequent to the disclosure date above
23		c. completion of discovery from experts: 90 days before trial
24		
25		H. ADDITIONAL TOPICS SET FORTH IN F.R.C.P. 26(F)
26	1.	Electronic Discovery:
27		The parties agree to produce any electronically stored documents in a manner which
28	meets	the Federal requirement of producing electronic data in reasonably useable form. The

1	parties further agree to limit requests for metadata to five individuals but reserve the right to	
2	seek metadata from additional individuals as needed.	
3	2. Privilege:	
4	The parties games that a true tioned mestactive and an about he automate according the	
5	The parties agree that a two-tiered protective order should be entered governing the	
6	handling of confidential material. The parties will work towards a proposed protective order.	
7	I. PRETRIAL AND TRIAL SCHEDULE	
8	1. Trial date: February 9, 2009	
9		
10	2. Anticipated length of trial (number of days): 4 days	
11	3. Type of trial: X jury court	
12	4. Final pretrial conference date: January 26, 2009	
13	5. Deadline to hear motions directed to the merits of all or part of the case: 60 days prior	
14	to the trial date	
15	J. DATE OF NEXT CASE MANAGEMENT/STATUS CONFERENCE	
16		
17	K. OTHER MATTERS	
18	None at this time	
19		
20	L IDENTIFICATION AND SIGNATURE OF LEAD TRIAL COUNSEL	
21	Dated: December 6, 2007  By Judith M Sellmanner	
22	Paul W. Vapnek Judith M. Schvimmer	
23	Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant	
24	SUNSET MOUNTAINS, INC., d/b/a MOSAIC TILE MARKET	
25	Dated: December 6, 2007  By Oulet E. Mouis	
26	John W. Dozier, Jr.	
27	Donald E. Morris Darrin Holender	
28	Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant MOSAIC TILE SUPPLIES, LLC	

1	The court finds that each party was represented by lead trial counsel responsible for trial of this
2	matter and was given an opportunity to be heard as to all matters encompassed by this Case
3	Management Statement and Proposed Order filed prior to this conference. The court adopts this
4	statement as modified.
5	The foregoing joint statement as amended is adopted by this court as the Case Management
6 7	Order in this action.
8	The Court makes the following additional orders:
9	
10	
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.
12	
13	Dated:  Honorable Phyllis J. Hamilton,  LINUTED STATES DISTRICT HIDGE
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15	61227488 v1
16	
17 18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	